

FOI number: **HBC_FOI_20190297**
Date FOI Received: **08/04/2019**
Department: **Parking Services**
Title: **Parking charges evidence**
Description: **Evidence used to inform Planning Application reference number TP/86/0091 and the introduction and increase in parking charges.**

Request: *(As Redacted sent by requestor)*

We are writing to you under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to request the following information:

1. Policies of the Hertfordshire County Structure Plan Alterations No 1 (1984) used to inform the determination of Planning Application Ref No: TP/86/0091;
2. Draft Borehamwood Town Centre Review (November 1984);
3. Empirical evidence used to inform the decision to introduce parking charges for Hertsmere Borough Council owned car parks in January 1996;
4. Empirical evidence used to inform the decision to increase parking charges for Hertsmere Borough Council owned car parks which came in to force on 1 August 2011;
5. The evidence base to inform the preparation of the Hertsmere Borough Council Parking Management Strategy (November 2012); and
6. Information pertaining to the further review of parking charges within the Borough post 2012.

Response: *(Response as Redacted sent by service)*

1. Hertsmere Borough Council does not hold this information.
2. Hertsmere Borough Council does not hold this information.

The council does not hold information in reply to your specific questions number 3,4, 5 and 6, what information we have available is attached. Please be advised that these documents are on the council's website, www.hertsmere.gov.uk.

Question 3. Please see Attachment A.

Question 4. Please see Committee report in relation to the 2011 parking charges increase.

Question 5. Please see Committee report in relation to the 2012 parking management strategy review.

Question 6. Please see Committee report in relation to the 2014 parking charges increase.

If you have any queries about the processing of your request then please do not hesitate to contact me. Further information explaining the Council's process for responding to information requests together with a complaints/appeals procedure is available in our reception or via our website at:

<https://www.hertsmere.gov.uk/Your-Council/Official-Publications--Guides--Policies/Access-to-Information.aspx>

The Information Commissioner oversees the application of the Freedom of Information Act. You may contact the Information Commissioner at:

Information Commissioners Office
Wycliffe House, Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF
Telephone: 01625 545700
Website: www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk

Please include the above reference number on all correspondence related to this request.

Thank you for your request.

Kind regards

Information Services

Hertsmere Borough Council | Civic Offices | Elstree Way | Borehamwood | Herts | WD6
1WA
t: 020 8207 2277

HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL

THE BOREHAMWOOD (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 1995

STATEMENT OF REASONS

To vary car parking charges in the Borehamwood area in order to defray increasing maintenance costs and to more efficiently regulate car park usage to reflect current trends.



HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO EXECUTIVE

Item no: 6.1

Document Reference no: EX/11/17

Date of Meeting / Decision: 16 February 2011

This is a key decision
call-in on the grounds of urgency.

Urgency: The proposals are not exempt from

**CHANGES TO PARKING CHARGES – ON STREET, OFF STREET CAR PARKS,
RESIDENT PERMITS AND ANNUAL VISITOR PERMITS**

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: COUNCILLOR JOHN DONNE

1 ACTION RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 That the Executive agree, subject to Council approval, the proposals for charges (as set out in Appendix 2), and authorise Officers to commence the preparation of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to enable the changes to be introduced.
- 1.2 That the Executive agree that any objections raised following advertisement of the TROs be brought to the attention of the Portfolio Holder who in consultation with the Leader of the Council should determine whether or not to proceed with confirming the TRO(s) or to instruct officers to amend the Order(s) and re-advertise accordingly.
- 1.3 That the Executive agree that the final proposed implementation date is to be agreed with the Portfolio Holder in conjunction with the Director of Environment.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / PROPOSALS

- 2.1 The Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 gives local authorities guidance when considering the introduction of parking controls. Enforcement authorities should design their parking policies with particular regard to:
 - 2.1.1. Managing the traffic network to ensure expeditious movement of traffic, (including pedestrians and cyclists), as required under the TMA Network Management Duty.
 - 2.1.2 Improving road safety.
 - 2.1.3. Improving the local environment
 - 2.1.4. Improving the quality and accessibility of public transport.
 - 2.1.5. Meeting the needs of people with disabilities, some of whom will be unable to use public transport and depend entirely on the use of a car.
 - 2.1.6. Managing and reconciling the competing demands for kerb space of residents, shops, businesses, pedestrians, motorists and so on.

- 2.2 In addition the TMA guidance goes on to state that enforcement authorities should run their Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) operations both on and off-street efficiently, effectively and economically. The purpose of penalty charges is to dissuade motorists from breaking parking regulations and parking and penalty charges should be proportionate, so authorities should not set them at unreasonable levels.
- 2.3 Previous guidance has advised that local authority parking enforcement should be self-financing as soon as practicable. This is still a sensible aim, but authorities are advised that if their scheme is not self financing, they need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit.

BACKGROUND TO PARKING CHARGES IN HERTSMERE

- 2.4 On 24 November 2004, the Council's Executive approved the introduction of decriminalisation of parking throughout the Borough (report EX/04/103). In order to reflect the views of Members and the public, consultation was carried out by MORI, a range of detailed arrangements were agreed.
- 2.5 At the time on and off street parking would remain unchanged in Bushey and Bushey Heath. A 'light touch' level of enforcement would be employed. There were a total of three public car parks in Bushey and Bushey Heath all of which operated on a 'free of charge' basis and the existing restrictions in the public car parks would not be enforced.
- 2.6 The 9 operational wardens would be broadly allocated as follows:
- 4 to Potters Bar
 - 3 to Borehamwood
 - 1 to Radlett
 - 0.5 to Bushey
 - 0.5 to the rural areas
- 2.7 That remains the current number of Civil Enforcement Officers who regularly patrol the Borough in addition to two supervisors and a (currently frozen) Civil Enforcement Officer post. It should be noted that the number of streets within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) has increased substantially since 2005 and Hertfordshire Highways continue to introduce new waiting restrictions around the Borough.
- 2.8 Commuter Parking Permits were introduced in November 2005. Commuters could purchase a yearly permit to park in the Furzehill Road Car Park, Borehamwood Car Park and the Newberries Car Park in Radlett, at a cost of £400.

2.9 On street 2005/6 tariffs were:

AREA	TARIFF
POTTERS BAR	UP TO 1 HOUR FREE
	1 – 2 HRS 80P
	2 – 3 HRS £1.50
	3 – 4 HRS £2.00
	4 – 5 HRS £3.00
	5 – 7 HRS £5.00
BOREHAMWOOD	UP TO 1 HOUR FREE
	1 – 2 HRS 80P
	OVER 2 HRS £1.50
RADLETT	UP TO 1 HOUR FREE
	1 – 2 HRS 50P

2.10 Potters Bar, prior to Decriminalisation in 2006 had 13 pay and display areas; the tariff was the same as in the car parks prior to the increase in October 2005. This meant that when Decriminalisation was implemented the first hour became 'free' in Potters Bar.

2.11 The first residents permit in CPZ areas throughout the Borough would remain free. Hertsmere was identified as being unique in this regard and contrary to the recommendations of the consultants who advised the Transportation Best Value Review carried out at the time.

2.12 Off street car parking charges in Potters Bar and Borehamwood, which have not increased in the subsequent five years (with all day charges reduced in 2007), are currently set at:

- Up to 1 hour 40p
- 1 - 2 hours 80p
- 2 - 3 hours £1.50
- 3 - 4 hours £2.00
- 4 - 5 hours £3.00
- over 5 hours £5.00

2.13 Off-street parking charges in Radlett have been part-subsidised by Aldenham Parish Council (£10,000 to cover the cost of the first hour) and as Radlett's facilities were considered to be very different from Borehamwood and Potters Bar, were set at a lower level:

- Up to 1 hour free
- 1 – 2 hours 35p
- 3 – 4 hours 65p
- 5 – 6 hours 85p
- Over 6 hours £5

2.14 From 1st November 2007, the cost of an additional Residential Parking Permit changed. The first permit per household remained free of charge, but any additional permit was charged as follows

- Second resident parking permit = £30
- Third resident parking permit = £60

- Fourth resident parking permit = £90

2.15 The Council also decided that the number of Residential Parking Permits were restricted to a maximum of four per household.

REVIEWING PARKING CHARGES

2.16 The TMA guidance states that the setting of the charges for parking off-street or in on-street in designated areas is a matter for individual Local Authorities exercising their responsibilities in accordance with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, rather than for the Secretary of State. Charges should be reviewed periodically and account taken of their effectiveness.

2.17 Local Authorities can vary their parking charges using a simplified procedure of public notices under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. However, Local Authorities should not use parking charges as a means of raising additional revenue or as a means of local taxation.

2.18 Where the demand for parking is high, the delivery of transport objectives with realistic demand management prices for parking may result in some surplus income. In such cases local authorities must ensure that any on-street revenue not used for enforcement is used for legitimate purposes only and that its main use is to improve, by whatever means, transport provision in the area so that road users receive the benefit.

2.19 There are a number of factors to which Local Authorities should have regard when setting or reviewing charges:-

2.19.1 Parking charges can be effective at helping to curb unnecessary car use where there is adequate public transport or walking or cycling are realistic alternatives, for example, in town centres.

2.19.2 Charges can reflect the value of kerb-space, encouraging all but short-term parking to take place in nearby off-street car parks where available. This implies a hierarchy of charges within a local authority area, so that charges at a prime parking space in a busy town centre would normally be higher than those either at nearby off-street car parks or at designated places in more distant residential areas.

CONSULTATION AND TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER PROCESS

2.20 The foundation of an effective parking enforcement regime is having legal and up-to-date Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in place. Local authorities can vary their parking charges using a simplified procedure of public notices under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

2.21 Local Authorities are expected to carry out appropriate consultation whenever changes are considered to CPE arrangements. The Council needs to consider whether the changes being considered are significant changes, having regard to the existing charging structure and the equivalent charges in place in nearby Local Authorities. It is expected that publicity around the proposed changes will be included in the next edition of Hertsmere News, in order to draw householders' attention to the proposals.

- 2.22 It will be necessary to write TROs for each of the proposed changes. The TROs outline the changes in each case and revoke part or all of the earlier TRO. As a minimum, each will be subject to advertising notices in the local newspapers, and notices on street signposts, for a required 21 day period. In the case of the off street car parks, notices will be placed on each pay and display machine and several around the car parks. With regard to the changes to resident's parking permit charges, a wider notice may need to be considered, such as posters or letters to residents. Once the TRO has been signed and sealed by the Council, a further notice is then advertised and a further 6 weeks allowed for legal challenges to the High Court.

3. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The current charges for on-street parking, off street car parks, resident's permits and for annual visitor permits are set too low, (when compared to neighbouring Local Authorities, as evidenced in Appendix 1) and do not currently allow Parking Services to be self-financing, as advised by Government Departments

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The on street parking regime could be retained as present, however the Council would need to continue to subsidise the service, contrary to government advice.
- 4.2 On street parking could be changed to 20p for the first hour of parking. There is local opposition to this proposal.
- 4.3 A hybrid of 30 minutes free within shopping parades only and a 20p first hour charge for all other spaces but this would have the potential to be confusing for the public.

5. PLANNED TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 5.1 Subject to the agreement of the Executive, it is proposed to commence the advertisement of TRO(s) at the end of February 2011. TROs relating to on-street parking are prepared in consultation with Herts Highways and so the timetable for completing the preparation of TROs will be subject to external influences.
- 5.2 Should objections be raised following advertisement of the proposed charging and permit cost changes, these would need to be considered and the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Transport be requested to determine whether to proceed with the charges, as originally proposed, or whether to make any amendments. Any amendments would require an amended TRO and a further period of advertisement. Should objections be received which result in amendments to the TRO, it is unlikely that any changes would take effect before the summer.
- 5.3 Once the TRO has been confirmed-and the scheme implemented, it is anticipated that there will be a grace period of a minimum of two weeks from implementation whereby motorists will be given advance warning of when any new charges take effect. Householders re-applying for new permits will be contacted by post in

advance of the expiration of their existing permit to make them aware of the changes to the charges. Where proposals for extended or new CPZs have already been subject to detailed consultation on the basis of there being no charge for the first permit, any charge for residents' first permit would be deferred for 12 months.

6. DELEGATION

- 6.1 Agreement to prepare and advertise the required TROs affecting the whole Borough is a decision for the Executive as a whole, although the consideration of any objections and the need for advertising any amendments to the TROs can be a matter for the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Transport, if agreed by the Executive (paragraph 1.2). Matters relating to the setting of new fees are a decision for the full Council.

7. FINANCIAL AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 To amend the charging regime to first 30 minutes free, with a 20p charge for the second 30 minutes may raise £150,000, however there is insufficient information on how the behaviour of motorists may change to avoid the 20p charge. For this reason it is not considered that a sum can be specified for a guaranteed level of income.
- 7.2 To increase the cost of the second hour of on-street parking from 50p to £1 in Radlett and 80p to £1 in the rest of the Borough, to bring it in line with the proposed off-street car park changes (see paragraph 7.4) for the second hour, could generate an additional £10,000. Again, as there is insufficient information on how the behaviour of motorists might change, it is not possible to specify a guaranteed level of income.
- 7.3 Charges for first residential permits that are currently free would, at £15 for the first permit, generate a projected £46,440. Charges for annual visitor parking permits that are currently £20 would, at £30 per visitor permit, generate a projected £8,750. There may be a temporary drop in the number of residential first permits requested however this is likely to return to the present level.
- 7.4 An increase in off-street parking charges from 40p to 50p for up to 1 hour and 80p to £1.00 for 1 – 2 hours would raise a projected £58,170 for Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey Heath. Newberries Car Park charges are currently at a lower level; the only change since the introduction of pay and display May 1996 was the all day charge. If charges were increased in line with the rest of the borough it could generate an estimated £30,000 in additional income. However this is subject to negotiations with Aldenham Parish Council who currently part subsidise these charges (see 2.13) Kemp Place car park off Bushey High Street has not been included at this stage as it is recognised that this may lead to a requirement to introduce CPZ parking bays in surrounding streets.
- 7.5 There will be a requirement for additional capital to purchase on street machines where currently there are no machines and a change of software for existing machines as set out in Appendix 2, a further report will follow for this requirement

including full financial implications.

8. EFFICIENCY SAVINGS

- 8.1 Officers are in negotiations with Aldenham Parish Council regarding their contribution to the first hour and a TRO will reflect a reduced or no charge for the first hour. The second hour would be charged as £1.00 and subsequent hours would be as per the Borough as a whole.

9. LEGAL POWERS RELIED ON AND ANY LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Amendments to the Parking Charges will need to be made by orders under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. The procedure to be followed in making these orders is set out in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 9.2 Use of surplus income from parking charges and penalty notices is governed by Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This in effect means that any surplus may be used for the provision of public transport services, road improvements or to fund local environmental improvements.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Estimated income levels have been based on the limited information currently available. In some cases there is no historical information to assist in projections and therefore all estimates are subject to change once more information is available. We are also largely dependant on the outcome of the consultation process.
- 10.2 If charges are set too high they could encourage drivers to risk non-compliance or to park in unsuitable areas, possibly in contravention of parking restrictions. In certain cases the charges could encourage motorists to park in other residential areas (causing inconvenience to those residents) or in neighbouring Local Authority areas. These locations may not have the capacity to handle the extra vehicles and displacement of parking to commercial areas in neighbouring local authority areas may have a negative impact on businesses in this Borough. By giving 30 minutes free and reasonable parking charges for subsequent hours, the Council is considered to be mitigating this risk.
- 10.3 If on-street charges are set too low they could attract higher levels of traffic than are desirable.

11. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 None arising from this report.

12. CORPORATE PLAN & POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 None arising from this report.

13. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLICATIONS

13.1 None arising from this report.

14. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

14.1 None arising from this report.

15. APPENDICES ATTACHED

15.1 Appendix 1 - Comparative fees and charges

15.2 Appendix 2 – Proposed new charges.

16. BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

16.1 Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996

Traffic Management Act 2004

Parking policy and enforcement operational guidance to local authorities.

17 AUTHORS

17.1 Polly Harris-Gorf
Email: Polly.harris-gorf@hertsmere.gov.uk
Extn. 5610



HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE

Item no: 6.1

Document Reference no: EX/12/63

Date of Meeting / Decision: 7 November 2012

This is a key decision
call-in on the grounds of urgency.

Urgency: The proposals are not exempt from

REVISED PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

A revised Parking Management Strategy for Hertsmere Borough Council has been prepared to update the previous Strategy, which was approved in 2005. The Strategy sets out how the Council will manage parking demand from residents, shoppers, long-stay visitors and commuters primarily in the Borough's residential and town centre locations. Key changes to the Strategy include the introduction of detailed criteria against which requests for new parking schemes and disabled bays will be considered by the Council.

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: COUNCILLOR JEAN HEYWOOD

1. ACTION RECOMMENDED

That the Executive:

- 1.1 Endorses the revised Parking Management Strategy (as attached at the Appendix) and recommends it for approval by full Council on 14th November, subject to any minor changes to be agreed in consultation between the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport, the Head of Planning and Building Control and the Head of Waste and Street Scene.
- 1.2 Requests that officers closely monitor the implementation of the proposed new Strategy and that a report be brought to the Environment Scrutiny Committee after 12 months to enable the impact of the revised Strategy to be considered, following an interim report to its Parking Review Group after 6 months.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / PROPOSALS

- 2.1 The updated Strategy builds on the Council's experiences following the decriminalisation of parking enforcement in 2006, taking account of the high level of demand for greater parking controls, particularly within residential areas. This has resulted in a very large number of requests for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), in

particular, within both established residential areas and new housing developments. Key changes to the Strategy include:

Criteria for new or extended CPZs (paragraphs 4.15 to 4.18)

- 2.2 The original Strategy contained no criteria for determining if and when to develop parking schemes, in response to requests from residents and local Councillors. At times, there have been almost 100 schemes on the Council's request list but the absence of clear criteria has made it difficult for officers to determine whether particular requests should be progressed. In a number of instances, requests from a small number of residents in an area have resulted in the designing of a detailed parking scheme, only for the proposal to be rejected by a greater number of residents, when consultation has subsequently been undertaken. In addition to the resource implications of such abortive work, it also has a knock-on effect on the completion of other CPZ work. Paragraphs 4.15 to 4.18 of the revised Strategy propose a series of clear criteria to address the above, in respect of residential areas.

CPZ or waiting restrictions (yellow lines) (paragraph 4.13)

- 2.3 Increasingly, the Council is receiving requests for CPZs in areas where residents have adequate off-street parking. A full CPZ can represent a disproportionate response as well as being expensive to implement/administer. The revised Strategy states that where there is a genuine problem caused by excessive all day parking, consideration may be given to waiting restrictions only.
- 2.4 The revised Strategy also emphasises that the public highway is for use by all road users and the Council will not introduce parking restrictions because residents do not want other people parking outside their houses.

Provision of Disabled Bays within CPZs (paragraphs 4.33 and 4.34)

- 2.5 The Council is responsible for considering requests for disabled bays within CPZs. However, the increasing number of requests, in addition to the resource implications of introducing additional bays (for which the Council does not charge a fee), has resulted in a proliferation of bays in certain roads. There is a need to ensure that adequate parking remains for other road users and paragraphs 4.33 and 4.34 introduce criteria to address this particular problem.

Advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders (paragraph 4.40)

- 2.6 This is a major expense for the Council but the process of advertising notices in local newspapers is currently being reviewed by the government. Paragraph 4.40 confirms that this is expected to change during 2013 and at this point, the Council will cease using local newspapers to routinely advertise Traffic Regulation Orders.

Future work priorities (Appendix)

- 2.7 A list of future work priorities are set out in the Appendix which expand on the range of issues in the main Strategy and also provide an indication of possible future change, across a range of parking related matters. It is intended that this Appendix be updated periodically without a need to review the full Strategy.

Parking Enforcement

- 2.8 A number of minor changes to the Council's detailed parking enforcement policy, also issued in 2005, are currently being finalised by the Parking Services Manager. These will be completed shortly and it is intended that this be incorporated into the Parking Management Strategy.

Consultation

- 2.9 The Parking Management Strategy is a non-statutory document and whilst forming part of the Council's policy framework, there is no statutory requirement to undertake consultation on the revised Strategy. However, the Strategy has been subject to scrutiny and consideration by Members on a number of occasions.
- 2.10 The Member Transport Panel on 4th October reviewed the Strategy and a number of minor clarification changes were made in response to the comments of the Member Transport Panel. The Member Parking Review Group, chaired by Cllr Keates and comprising three Councillors on the Environment Scrutiny Committee, were briefed on 11th October. The Group agreed that the full Scrutiny committee should consider the Strategy and that subsequently, the success or otherwise of the Parking Strategy should be reviewed in 6-12 months. The full Environment Scrutiny Committee received a presentation on the Strategy on 24th October resulting in a number of issues being raised including:
- Concerns around the proliferation of CPZs across the borough and the need to more carefully manage the number of new schemes
 - Parking displacement caused by the introduction of parking controls
 - Recognition of the need for officers to have some clear criteria against which to assess the need for parking schemes
 - Vehicles blocking the highway and the need for the police to be contacted in such instances
 - The roles / responsibilities of Hertsmere Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council and Hertfordshire Constabulary with regard to parking controls and parking enforcement
 - The specific roles / responsibilities of Policy Community Support Officers (PCSOs)
 - Use of blue badges and use of/potential for charging for disabled bays
- 2.11 The Committee endorsed the Strategy and welcomed its planned introduction given the issues which have arisen since 2005 following the decriminalisation of parking enforcement. The minutes of the Committee meeting will be published in due course on the Council's website.
- 2.12 It is, therefore, recommended that the implementation of the proposed new Strategy be closely monitored and a report be brought to the Environment Scrutiny Committee after 12 months to enable the impact of the revised Strategy to be considered. In addition, the Parking Review Group, chaired by Cllr Carey Keates, will be updated on the implementation of the Strategy after 6 months, in response to a request from the chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Committee.

3 **REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 An updated Strategy is considered necessary in light of the Council's experiences since the decriminalisation of parking enforcement in 2005 and in particular, the volume of requests for parking schemes across the borough.

4 **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 4.1 To not endorse the revised Parking Management Strategy and recommend it to full Council for approval would result in the continued absence of clear criteria against which requests for parking schemes and disabled parking bays can be considered. This will exacerbate the current difficulties experienced whereby (a) significant work may be carried out on schemes which subsequently fail to attract sufficient support from the local community and (b) the request list for parking schemes remaining excessively long with many of the schemes added having little likelihood of being progressed within a reasonable timescale.

5 **PLANNED TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 5.1 There is some urgency to issuing a revised Strategy, notwithstanding that the original Strategy is now seven years old. This follows recent requests by the Portfolio Holder for the work to be undertaken in light of the number of parking scheme requests. The planned timetable for its implementation is set out below, with the proposed revised Strategy, subject to Member agreement, taking effect following the meeting of the full Council on 14th November.

- Member Transport Panel – 4th October
- Environment Scrutiny – 24th October
- Executive – 7th November
- Full Council – 14th November

6 **DELEGATION**

- 6.1 Whether or not to endorse the revised Strategy and recommend its subsequent approval is a decision for the Executive. As part of the Council's policy framework, the approval of the revised Strategy would be a matter for the full Council.

7 **FINANCIAL AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The revised Strategy has been prepared by officers and so those costs have been absorbed into the existing revenue budget for 2012/13 for the Policy and Transport team.

8 **EFFICIENCY SAVINGS**

- 8.1 The revised Strategy is expected to lead to the more efficient use of officer time through a reduction in the number of abortive schemes, where detailed designs have been drawn up and consulted on but not carried through to implementation.

The commitment to cease advertising Traffic Regulation Orders in local newspapers will, subject to the required changes to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, result in estimated savings of £15,000 per year.

9 **LEGAL POWERS RELIED ON AND ANY LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

10 **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 None identified.

11 **PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None identified.

12 **CORPORATE PLAN & POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 'Improving and sustaining the quality of Hertsmere's environment' is one of the six strategic objectives contained in the Community Strategy. One of the key objectives in the Corporate Plan is to protect or enhance the built environment of which sub objective 3 is to:

- Use our Controlled Parking Zone powers to improve the quality of residential environments whilst not stifling local businesses and commerce.
- Manage road traffic to improve the quality of the environment, including air quality

13 **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 None.

14 **HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 None.

15 **APPENDICES ATTACHED**

15.1 Appendix: Revised Parking Management Strategy

16 **BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**

16.1 None.

17 **AUTHORS**

Mark Silverman, Policy and Transport Manager
Extn. 5850. Email: mark.silverman@hertsmere.gov.uk

HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE

Item no: 6.3

Document Reference No: EX/14/12

Date of Meeting / Decision: 15 January 2014

This is a key decision
call-in on the grounds of urgency.

Urgency: The proposals are not exempt from

**CHANGES TO PARKING CHARGES – ON STREET, OFF STREET CAR PARKS,
RESIDENT PERMITS AND ANNUAL VISITOR PERMITS**

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: COUNCILLOR J HEYWOOD

1. ACTION RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 That the Executive agree the proposals for charges (as set out in this report), and authorise Officers to commence the preparation of variations to existing relevant Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to enable the changes to be introduced and notes the proposed capital expenditure of £1.036M for maintenance and upgrade of Council-owned car parks as explained in agenda item 6.8 (EX/14/03).
- 1.2 That the Executive agree that the final proposed implementation date is to be agreed with the Portfolio Holder in conjunction with the Director of Environment.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / PROPOSALS

- 2.1 The Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 gives local authorities guidance when considering the introduction of parking controls. Enforcement authorities should design their parking policies with particular regard to:
 - Managing the traffic network to ensure expeditious movement of traffic, (including pedestrians and cyclists), as required under the TMA Network Management Duty.
 - Improving road safety.
 - Improving the local environment
 - Improving the quality and accessibility of public transport.
 - Meeting the needs of people with disabilities, some of whom will be unable to use public transport and depend entirely on the use of a car.
 - Managing and reconciling the competing demands for kerb space of residents, shops, businesses, pedestrians, and motorists.
- 2.2 In addition the TMA guidance goes on to state that enforcement authorities should run their Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) operations both on and off-street efficiently, effectively and economically. The purpose of penalty charges is to

dissuade motorists from breaking parking regulations and parking and penalty charges should be proportionate, so authorities should not set them at unreasonable levels.

- 2.3 Previous guidance has advised that local authority parking enforcement should be self-financing as soon as practicable. This is still a sensible aim, but authorities are advised that if their scheme is not self financing, they need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit.
- 2.4 On 24 November 2004, the Council's Executive approved the introduction of decriminalisation of parking throughout the Borough (report EX/04/103). In order to reflect the views of members and the public, consultation was carried out by MORI, and a range of detailed arrangements were agreed.
- 2.5 Commuter Parking Permits were introduced in November 2005. Commuters can purchase a yearly permit to park in the Furzehill Road Car Park, Borehamwood Car Park and the Newberries Car Park in Radlett, at a cost of £400 a year.
- 2.6 On street tariffs current and proposed:

	Current	Proposed	Increase
0-30 min	FREE	FREE	-
1 hr	20p	50p	30p
1-2 hrs	£1.00	£1.50	50p
2-3 hrs	£1.50	£2.00	50p
3-4 hrs	£2.00	£3.00	£1.00
4-5 hrs	£3.00	£4.00	£1.00
Over 5hrs	£5.00	£5.00	-

- 2.7 Off-street (Car Parks) parking charges current and proposed are:

	Current	Proposed	Increase
* First hr	50p	70p	20p
1-2 hrs	£1.00	£1.50	50p
2-3 hrs	£1.50	£2.00	50p
3-4 hrs	£2.00	£3.00	£1.00
4-5 hrs	£3.00	£4.00	£1.00
Over 5 hrs	£5.00	£5.00	-

* Newberries car park currently allows for free parking for the 1st hour. This is due to a subsidy received from Aldenham Parish Council.

- 2.8 In addition Kemp Place car park off Bushey High Street has not been included at this stage as it is recognised that this may lead to a requirement to introduce CPZ parking bays in surrounding streets.

2.9 Annual Residential Parking Permit charges current and proposed are:

	Current	Proposed	Increase
First	£15	£25	£10
Second	£30	£40	£10
Third	£60	£70	£10
Fourth	£90	£100	£10
Visitor	£30	£40	£10

The Council allows a maximum of four per household.

3. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The current charges for on-street parking, off street car parks, resident's permits and for annual visitor permits are set low, (when compared to neighbouring Local Authorities, as evidenced in Appendix 1) and do not currently allow Parking Services to be self-financing, as advised by Government Departments.
- 3.2 On - going reductions in revenue support grant funding, has resulted in an inability to provide a subsidy directly to this service, the charges proposed are design to ensure a breakeven outcome for the next financial year 2014/15 and thereafter.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The current level of charges could be retained as present, however the Council would need to continue to subsidise the service, contrary to government advice.

5. PLANNED TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 5.1 Subject to the agreement of the Executive, and due to existing commitments, it is proposed to program the preparation work required to implement the required variations to the relevant TRO(s) at the start of the new financial year 2014/15 .It is envisaged that these charges will be introduced during June 2014.

6. DELEGATION

- 6.1 Agreement to prepare and advertise the required TROs affecting the whole Borough is a decision for the Executive as a whole. Matters relating to the setting of new fees are a decision for the full Council.

7. FINANCIAL AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 To amend the charging regime to first 30 minutes free, with a 50p charge for the second 30 minutes could raise an additional annual income of £126,000. However there is not sufficient information on how the behaviour of motorists may change to avoid the 50p charge.
- 7.2 An increase in off-street parking charges from 50p to 70p for up to 1 hour; £1 to £1.50 for 1 to 2 hours, and increases per hour after that, could generate an

additional annual income of £140,280. This again is subject to possible changes in motorists behaviour to avoid the increased charges.

- 7.3 This figure does not include a charge at Newberries Car Park for the 1st hour. However this is subject to negotiations with Aldenham Parish Council who currently part subsidising these charges. Kemp Place car park, off Bushey High Street, has not been included at this stage as it is recognised that this may lead to a requirement to introduce CPZ parking bays in surrounding streets.
- 7.4 Increasing charges for residential permits by £10 per permit may generate an additional income of approximately £30,250. However it is anticipated that there may be a drop in the number of residential permits requested.
- 7.5 All additional income is estimated based on current usage and officer's best guess on the effect of the increased charges. However, it is not possible to predict the exact change in motorist's behaviour and therefore income levels cannot be guaranteed. Should income levels be greater than predicted then these funds will need to be re-invested into the further development and renewal of the parking services infrastructure.
- 7.6 Estimated cost of implementation:
- | | |
|-----------------|--------|
| Advertising TRO | £3,000 |
| Signage changes | £4,000 |

These costs to be funded from the existing Parking Services revenue budget and the Parking Services repairs and renewals fund.

- 7.7 It is worth noting that the majority of the income raised from these increased parking charges will be utilised towards maintenance and upgrade of the Council-owned car parks. Item 8 on this agenda (document ref EX/14/03) proposes to the meeting of the Full Council on 26 February 2014 approval of the sum of £1.036M for this purpose.

8. EFFICIENCY SAVINGS

- 8.1 None apart from those detailed in the report.

9. LEGAL POWERS RELIED ON AND ANY LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Amendments to the Parking Charges will need to be made by issuing variations to existing orders under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. The procedure to be followed in varying these orders is set out in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 9.2 Use of surplus income from parking charges and penalty notices is governed by Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This in effect means that any surplus may be used for the provision of public transport services, road improvements or to fund local environmental improvements.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Estimated income levels have been based on the limited information currently available. In some cases there is no historical information to assist in projections and therefore all estimates are subject to change once more information is available.
- 10.2 If charges are set too high they could encourage drivers to risk non-compliance or to park in unsuitable areas, possibly in contravention of parking restrictions. In certain cases the charges could encourage motorists to park in other residential areas (causing inconvenience to those residents) or in neighbouring Local Authority areas. These locations may not have the capacity to handle the extra vehicles and displacement of parking to commercial areas in neighbouring local authority areas may have a negative impact on businesses in this Borough. By giving 30 minutes free and reasonable parking charges for subsequent hours, the Council is considered to be mitigating this risk.
- 10.3 If on-street charges are set too low they could attract higher levels of traffic than are desirable.

11. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 None arising from this report.

12. CORPORATE PLAN & POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 None arising from this report.

13. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 None arising from this report.

14. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 14.1 None arising from this report.

15. APPENDICES ATTACHED

- 15.1 Appendix A - Comparative fees and charges.

16. BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

- 16.1 Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
Traffic Management Act 2004.

Parking policy and enforcement operational guidance to local authorities.

17. AUTHOR

17.1 Steve Burton – Head of Street Scene
Email: steve.burton@hertsmere.gov.uk

Extn: 5242

Comparative Parking Charges**St. Albans District Council**

Parking charges vary across the authority, but the main charges are detailed below:

Car Park Charges are as follows:

30 mins	£0.60
1 hour	£1.20
2 hours	£2.60
2-5 hours	£3.60
5-24 hours	£9.00

Main exceptions:

Westminster Lodge (Leisure Centre) - Up to 3 hours free. Up to 5 hours £2. & 5 + hours £4.
Victoria Street – Hourly rate £1. Daily rate £7.

Barnet Council

Parking charges vary across the authority, but the main charges are detailed below:

Mill Hill

Up to 30 mins	£1.00
Up to 1 hr	£2.00
Up to 1 1/2 hr	£3.00
Over	£5.00

Barnet

Up to 30 mins	£0.50 / £0.75
Up to 1 hours	£1.00/ £1.70
Up to 90 mins	£2.70
Up to 2 hours	£3.60
Over 2 hours	£3.95

Welwyn & Hatfield District Council

Parking charges vary across the authority, but the main charges are detailed below:

0-1hr	£0.50/£1
1-2 hours	£1.50
2-3 hours	£2.50
3-4 hours	£3.50
4-5 hours	£4.50
5 + hours	£10
Sunday	£1 daily charge

Main exceptions:

Some car parks in Old Hatfield & Hatfield are free

Watford Borough Council

Parking charges vary across the authority, but the main charges are detailed below:

Shopping Centre

Up to 1 hr	£1.00
2 hours	£2.00
3 hours	£2.50
4 hours	£3.00
5 hours	£6.00
6 hours	£9.00

Comparative Permit Charges			
<u>St. Albans District Council</u>			
<i>Charges vary depending on which zone you live in</i>			
St Albans			
	1st	2nd	3rd
Zone 1	£19	£66	£144 (2 hrs only)
Zone 2	£38	£132	£288 (all day)
Zone 3	£50	£176	£320
<u>Barnet Council</u>			
<i>Charges reduced following a recent judicial review</i>			
	1st	2nd	3rd
All Zones	£40	£70	£70
<u>Welwyn & Hatfield District Council</u>			
<i>1st permit free to blue badge holders</i>			
	1st	2nd	3rd
All Zones	£25	£40	£60
<u>Watford Borough Council</u>			
<i>Charges vary depending on which zone you live in</i>			
	1st	2nd	
Zones M & N	£6	£12	
All Other Zones	£22	£52	
<i>1st permit free to blue badge holders</i>			